

Remarks:

Claim Objections

Claims 2 was objected to for failing to include the word “region” after “n+”. This has been corrected.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 2-6 were rejected over Ker ‘848.

Claim 2 specifically requires that the p+ region and n+ region be forward biased. This is not shown in Ker. In fact, Ker shows in Figure 3a that p+ region 58 and n+ region 60 are connected to a common contact. Thus there is no voltage differential between p+ region 58 and n+ region 60. Therefore it cannot be forward biased.

Claim 3 has been amended to include this limitation as well, and claim 2 has been further amended to make it clear that the forward bias is between the p+ region and additional n+ region.

In view of the amendment to claim 3, claim 5 has been canceled and claim 6 has been amended.

Since all of the claims require that the p+ region and n+ region formed in the p-well be forward biased under normal operation, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are distinguishable over the cited art. Since an amendment shall be entered after final if it places the claims in a condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the amendments be entered and the claims be allowed in their amended state.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 11/3/, 2004



Jurgen K. Vollrath

VOLLRATH & ASSOCIATES
588 Sutter Street #531, San Francisco, CA, 94102
Telephone: (408) 667 1289